

August 24, 1968

Mr. Stan Steiner
c/o The National Guardian
197 East 4th St.,
New York, N.Y. 10009

Dear Mr. Steiner,

The egregious error in your review of Lane's book can come from ignorance of the field, which qualifies all other reviewers, so why not you?, or is a natural consequence of the Guardian policy, that because it was decent enough to print his first piece when no one else would, he is the only one.

When you lament, correctly, that he "begs the bloody question", then add, "the mournful (is this the right word) books attacking the Warren Commission have almost all shied away from the frightening why", you are really indicting the Guardian, which has steadfastly refused to acknowledge the existence of the only writing of which this is not true.

My fourth book, OSWALD IN NEW ORLEANS, has the subtitle, "Case for Conspiracy with the CIA", a title and subtitle that did not interest the Guardian.

Thanks to such generous assistance as the Guardian joined the commercial press in extending me, I have three unpublished books to add to the four printed. One of these is entitled COUP D'ETAT.

The press of the left has become its own kind of establishment organ. Particularly on this subject, I asked the Guardian for help when, long after I was forced to a private printing, I put my first (and the first) book on the subject in general distribution. It is still one of the two really definitive books on the broad subject (Rush to Judgement, in my opinion, is not). No answer from the Guardian, which would not even review it until Cedric Belfrage, from Mexico, insisted. Why not read that review now? The three subsequent ones, including the third, with 150 pages of photographic reproduction of suppressed documents that carry a heavy subplot on motive, what you seek, have never been acknowledged by the Guardian.

There is no point in continuing. When a paper like the Guardian undertakes to review a book like A Citizens Descent, it ought to know what it is doing. When you say such things as you did, you ought to know from something other than the not impartial author that they bear a resemblance to reality. Mark's second book is as corrupt and dishonest a piece of writing, blended with open thievery, as there ever was. For crap like this the Guardian has space, but for solid work that addresses itself to the core of the issue it has none. I look forward to your commentary on the second Epstein book, a Viking reprint of his New Yorker slander, due next month. By that time the Guardian should be ready to welcome him.

And all the writing in the field is not just criticism of the Warren Report. If you will not find it in Mark's, there is writing that does bring out suppressed evidence.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg